

## REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 30, 2007. Claims 1 to 32 are pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 11 to 14 and 28 to 32 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 12, 31 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Without conceding the correctness of the rejection, Claims 12, 31, and 32 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1 to 13, 28, 30 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,363,211 (Hasebe). Claims 14 to 16, 21 to 27, 29 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hasebe in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,459,586 (Nagasato). Claims 17 to 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hasebe in view of Nagasato, and in further view of JP 2000-261644 (Hideyuki). Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns calculating an image movement amount and a magnification ratio in response to an instruction to move an arbitrary point of a displayed image, and displaying the image on the basis of the calculated movement amount and magnification ratio. In this manner, a trimming of the displayed image can be performed by designating the displayed image and then moving the designated image to a desired position by a pointing device. A mark suggesting appropriate framing of an image subjected to the trimming process is displayed on the image during a trimming mode. The

mark is displayed to guide movement of the image caused by the pointing device in the trimming process. Furthermore, a grid is displayed on the image during the dragging of the image by the pointing device, in the trimming process.

Turning now to specific claim language, independent Claim 1 is directed to an image editing method. The method includes the steps of instructing to move an arbitrary point of an image displayed in an image display area among image data; calculating an image movement amount and a magnification ratio in response to the instruction to move the arbitrary point; and displaying a predetermined area of the image data in the image display area on the basis of image movement amount and the magnification ratio, which are calculated in the calculating step.

Featured in Claim 1 is calculating an image movement amount and a magnification ratio in response to an instruction to move an arbitrary point of a displayed image.

In contrast, Hasebe discloses a digital copier for enlarging or reducing an image region of a document. A user designates an image region to be magnified/reduced and a magnification/reduction size by drawing double-looped marked lines differing in color. In the case where an image region is magnified, the image area is encircled with a color marker so that a closed loop can be formed, and further the outside of the closed loop is encircled with another color marker for indicating an image region after magnification (a magnification size). In the case where an image region is reduced, the image area is encircled with a color marker so that a closed loop can be formed around the image, and at the same time, a closed loop of different color is formed inside the aforementioned loop so that an image region after reduction can be indicated. As a result of the foregoing, the

image region and post-change size can be detected, and when a comparison is made between the two, the variable magnification/reduction ration can be found.

While Hasebe discloses determining a magnification ratio, Hasebe is silent on an instruction to move an arbitrary point of a displayed image. The instruction disclosed in Hasebe is an instruction to magnify the image, not move the image. Moreover, Hasebe is silent on calculating an image movement. Furthermore, the image region disclosed in Hasebe is an image on a physical document that can be marked with a color marker. Therefore, Hasebe is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of calculating an image movement amount and a magnification ratio in response to an instruction to move an arbitrary point of a displayed image, as featured in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Independent Claims 11, 12, and 13 are an apparatus, computer-executable program, and computer-readable recording medium substantially in accordance with the method of Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 11, 12, and 13 are also in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Independent Claim 28 is directed to an image editing method. The method includes performing a trimming process on image data in a trimming mode; and displaying, on an image to be subjected to the trimming process, a mark suggesting appropriate framing of a main object in the image, when the trimming mode is set.

As discussed above, the image region disclosed in Hasebe is an image on a physical document, and the image region and the post-change region are drawn on the document with a color marker. Therefore, Hasebe is not seen to disclose or suggest at least

the feature of displaying a mark suggesting appropriate framing of an image subjected to a trimming process on the image during a trimming mode, as featured in Claim 28.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 28 is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Independent Claims 30 and 32 are an apparatus and computer-executable program substantially in accordance with the method of Claim 28. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 30 and 32 are also in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Amended independent Claim 14 is directed to an image editing method. The method includes performing a trimming process on image data in a trimming mode; and displaying a grid on an image to be subjected to the trimming process, during a dragging of the image by a pointing device.

The Office Action concedes that, Hasebe is silent on displaying of a grid on an image to be subjected to a trimming process when a trimming mode is set.

Nagasato discloses an image enchasing and synthesizing function for setting an image in a trimmed area of an extracted original sheet into a masked area of a base original sheet, and synthesizing the images of the two original sheets. Nagasato discloses inputting coordinates entered for the trimmed area and masked area by operations on numerical value keys of a user interface, and inputting markers by which the areas are read on the base original sheet and the extracted original sheet. However, Nagasato is silent on dragging an image by a pointing device.

Therefore, Hasebe and Nagasato, either alone or in combination, are not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of performing a trimming process on image

data in a trimming mode; and displaying a grid on an image to be subjected to the trimming process, during a dragging of the image by a pointing device, as featured in Claim 14.

In light of the deficiencies of Hasebe and Nagasato as discussed above, Applicant submits that Claim 14 is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Independent Claims 29 and 31 are an apparatus and computer-executable program substantially in accordance with the method of Claim 14. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 29 and 31 are also in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

The other pending claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed allowable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

### CONCLUSION

No claim fees are believed due; however, should it be determined that additional claim fees are required, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 50-3939.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank Cire #42,419/  
Frank L. Cire  
Attorney for Applicant

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FGHS\_WS 1429488v1